



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/042,482	01/09/2002	Raji Lakshmi Akella	AUS920010666US1	6094
7590	01/06/2005		EXAMINER	
Duck W. Yee Carstens, Yee & Cahoon, LLP P.O. Box 802334 Dallas, TX 75380			ROMANO, JOHN J	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2122	

DATE MAILED: 01/06/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Applicant(s) 10/042,482	Applicant(s) AKELLA ET AL.
	Examiner John J Romano	Art Unit 2122

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01/09/2002, 03/01/2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 01 March 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>11/13/03, 11/21/03, 12/22/03</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-33 are pending in this action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Evans et al., US 2002/0152294 A1, (hereinafter **Evans**).

3. In regard to claim 1, **Evans** discloses:

- *"A method in a data processing system for executing and processing data in an object oriented environment, said method comprising the data processing system implemented steps of: defining a base class and a subclass within an object, said object defined within said object*

oriented environment...", (E.g., see Figure 15 & Page 1 & Paragraph [0010]), wherein the base class is the root class.

- *"...defining an attribute within said subclass; and storing, within said base class, attribute data defined for said attribute, wherein said attribute data is not stored within said subclass."*, (E.g., see Figure 14 & Page 8, Paragraphs [0146]-[0150]), wherein it is inherent that subclasses may define attributes. Further, the data is stored in the MIB tables, which contain the values of the defined attributes of the subclasses.

4. In regard to claim 2, the rejections of base claim 1 are incorporated.

Furthermore, **Evans** discloses:

- *"...storing only within said base class said attribute data for said attribute."*, (E.g., see Figures 1 to 3 & Page 3, Paragraph [0049]), wherein the MIB is taught to be a data structure holding physical properties of data or attribute data and the Entity-MIB is the Information base or base class.

5. In regard to claim 3, the rejections of base claim 1 are incorporated.

Furthermore, **Evans** discloses:

- *"...defining a storage attribute within said base class; and storing within storage attribute said attribute data."*, (E.g., see Figures 1 to 3 & Page 3, Paragraph [0049]), wherein the MIB is taught to be a data structure holding physical properties of data or storage attribute and

the MIB is the Information base or base class. The routing tables are the attribute data stored in the storage structure.

6. In regard to claim 4, the rejections of base claim 1 are incorporated.

Furthermore, **Evans** discloses:

- *"...defining a second subclass, wherein said subclass is a superclass to said second subclass; defining a second attribute within said second subclass; and storing within said base class second attribute data for said second attribute, wherein said second attribute data is not stored within said second subclass or said subclass."*, (E.g., see Figure 14 & Page 9, Paragraphs [0150] & [0151]), wherein steps are given to provide for subclasses of super-classes and the extension of the table to represent the attributes of the sub-classes.

7. In regard to claim 5, the rejections of base claim 4 are incorporated.

Furthermore, **Evans** discloses:

- *"...and said second attribute data."*, (E.g., see Figure 14 & Page 8, Paragraph [0150]), wherein table extensions are generated for sub-classes.

8. In regard to claim 6, the rejections of base claim 5 are incorporated.

Furthermore, **Evans** discloses:

- *"...defining a first index for and associating it with said attribute; defining a second index for and associating it with said second attribute; storing within said storage attribute said attribute data with*

said first index; and storing within said storage attribute said second attribute data with said second index.", (E.g., see Figure 9 & Page 5, Paragraph [0068]), wherein a first and second index are shown for multiple attributes and the container holds the attributes data.

9. In regard to claim 7, the rejections of base claim 1 are incorporated.

Furthermore, **Evans** discloses:

- "...*defining an index for and associating it with said attribute; and storing within said base class said attribute data for said attribute with said index.*", (E.g., see Figure 8 & Page 5, Paragraph [0066]), wherein the entity MIB is the base class which, stores the attribute data with the index.

10. In regard to claim 8, the rejections of base claim 7 are incorporated.

Furthermore, **Evans** discloses:

- "...*defining a method that needs to act on all attribute data of an object; and defining said method only for said base class, wherein said method acts on attribute data stored in said storage attribute.*", (E.g., see Figure 5 & Page 4, Paragraph [0054]), wherein the method is the operations the operator performs on the attribute data stored in the MIB.

11. In regard to claim 9, the rejections of base claim 7 are incorporated.

Furthermore, **Evans** discloses:

- "...defining a write object method to write all object attribute data; and defining said method only for said base class, wherein said method will write all data stored in said storage attribute.", (E.g., see Figure 5 & page 4, Paragraph [0054]), wherein the write method is defined as one of the operations the operator performs on the attribute data stored in the MIB. Furthermore, it is inherent in object-oriented programming that a method defined in a base class, which is desired to be available in all subclasses, need not be defined again in any subclass as one of the principals of object-oriented languages is to inherit logic operations from super-classes.

12. In regard to claim 10, the rejections of base claim 1 are incorporated.

Furthermore, **Evans** discloses:

- "...defining a method that needs to act on all attribute data of an object; and defining said method only for said base class, wherein said method acts on said attribute data.", (E.g., see Figure 5 & page 4, Paragraph [0054]), wherein the method is the operations the operator performs on the attribute data stored in the MIB. Furthermore, it is inherent in object-oriented programming that a method defined in a base class, which is desired to be available in all subclasses, need not be defined again in any subclass; as one of the principals of object-oriented languages is to inherit logic operations from super-classes.

Art Unit: 2122

13. In regard to claim **11**, the rejections of base claim **1** are incorporated.

Furthermore, **Evans** discloses:

- "...said base class being a superclass of said object.", (E.g., see Figure 14 & page 8, Paragraphs [0146]-[0151]), wherein the root class is the base class. Additionally, it is inherent that a root class that includes a subclass is a super-class.

14. Claims **12-22** and **23-33** are system and product versions respectively of the method disclosed in claims **1-11**. Thus, the limitations of claims **12-22** and **23-33** are met as disclosed in claims **1-11** above.

Conclusion

15. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Segal et al., US005418961A
- Dechamboux, US006052528A
- Hattori et al., US006539388B1
- Leong et al., US006772172B2
- Leonhardt et al., US 20020188592A1
- Kassabgi et al., US006003037A
- Golde, US006230159B1
- Ball et al., US006138269A .

Art Unit: 2122

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John J Romano whose telephone number is (571) 272-3872. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-5:30, M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tuan Q Dam can be reached on (571) 272-3695. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



TUAN DAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER